

Date: Sat, 21 May 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #216
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 21 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 216

Today's Topics:

Code test speeds (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 20 May 1994 13:19:35 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

barry@w2up.wells.com (Barry Kutner)

> All waivers must be gotten from doctors who are hams

> This way both medical problems and CW abilities are well understood

Although a good idea, I don't think its practical, since some health
plans may not have a physician who is a ham. Thus someone would have to
go to a non-provider physician and incur an out-of-pocket expense, or not
get a waiver at all, which defeats the purpose.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Fri, 20 May 1994 13:17:28 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

> [Fairly intelegent and fairly well expressed MD comments deleted]

Gee Dan, a compliment. Next thing you know you'll be agreeing with me! :-)

> You continue to miss the point, it is NOT that it is "too hard" it is that
> it is NOT RELEVANT. To require effort, just for efforts sake is hazing.
> Either admit it and quit the argueing or listen to the comments. Very few
> have opposed the code because it is "too hard".

Its always been my understanding, from even 10 years ago when my father-in-law and brothers-in-law wanted me to get involved in the hobby that the two aspects of the examinations were designed to test your ability to grasp theory, and test your operating abilities in one particular mode. The concept being that there is "theory", but there is also "in practice".

Now, I'll agree with you that the code test is not relevent to those people who simply wish to work SSB on HF. But, what do we replace it with? A SSB operating test? But then people would complain that THAT test isn't relevent, or that its "outdated", since SSB is as almost as old as CW.

I've stated before that I'm all for reducing the code requirements for HF, but only if we can insure that people coming into the hobby have a good grasp of theory and operation. But, even that doesn't appear good enough for some people, who apparently think that amateur licenses should simply be given away with simpleton questions, or even no examination at all - that the license is somehow an "entrance" level license, and thus we should excuse all stupidity or learning for the sake of getting people into the hobby. Again, quantity rather than quality.

When I feel more comfortable that the theory examinations meet the expectation I outlined above, then I will support code reductions or eliminations. However, I doubt its ever going to happen. The "dumbing down" of the theory is only the logical progression in the hobby, since trends in the hobby reflect trends in american society as a whole.

I anticipate that within 10 years the code requirements will be completely eliminated, and most of the theory examinations, if not eliminated as well, will be so easy that a monkey with a crayon could pass the exam. If you

examine happenings in amateur radio, you will see that this is not too far from the mark - first, forces worked to get the code requirement eliminated for an "entry level" license; they are now working on eliminating the requirement altogether; and, at the same time, the theory exams get dumbed down - for instance, the Novice pool was rewritten for what? A 6th grade reading level?

All I have to do is look back those ten years when I first started to get involved in the hobby. My father-in-law, who has been licensed almost twice as long as I've been alive (and no, he doesn't ride around in a geeze-mobile) introduced me to some of his ham friends in the area who were into computer/ham stuff (i.e. packet, rtty with a computer, etc.) These guys were "Extras"... Not the "Instant Extras" we have today, but Real Hams[tm] who really knew their stuff. These guys were huge vats of knowledge you could ask anything and get an answer, and they didn't mind sitting down with you and explaining it in detail. Maybe they did CW, maybe they didn't. I don't know nor do I care.

Today, however, I hear "Instant Extras" on the radio talking (incorrectly) about how to make a dipole. The usual conclusion to the conversation is "I'm gonna call HRO fer sure."

Then I look at the licensing system, and say to myself: "this is what its given us." Great.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Sat, 21 May 1994 01:34:54 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2rb72p\$9hb@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <1994May18.100515.18323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<2rndgd\$qvo@nyx10.cs.du.edu><1994May19.102423.2447@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

In article <1994May19.102423.2447@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, Gary Coffman
(gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) writes:

>No, you're still confusing *exit* requirements with entrance requirements.

>An amateur license is like the SAT that gets you *into* college where you
>actually do whatever learning you're going to do. The difference between
>college and amateur radio is the only way to graduate in amateur radio
>is to die (or let your license lapse).
>

This isn't a valid analogy, unless maybe the college you're entering
will allow you to be a student forever, with a full scholarship and no
possibility of being kicked out.

After you take a real-life entrance exam, you have to continue to
demonstrate that you're making progress towards some goal. No such
requirement exists in amateur radio. You can be a Novice or Tech
forever, and forget everything you ever learned to pass the test, as
long as you remember to renew your ticket every 10 years.

Clearly, a ham license is more like a professional exam such as the
Bar Exam, where you need to demonstrate a reasonable level of knowledge
on the subject precisely because if you pass the test you *will* be on
your own from then on, unless you do something stupid or illegal
enough to draw official attention to yourself. The ham exam, likewise,
is the *last* chance to see if you have a certain minimum knowledge
before you are let loose on the bands forever.

Mike, KK6GM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #216
